



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

among the southern Semites. In the North (Babylon) sun and Venus exchange rôles as the sun becomes masculine and Venus becomes feminine (this Babylonian view is a later form). St. Paul's Holy Spirit is the Kyrios or divine Son (and sun) transferred to Jesus, although the mother-goddess was the sun (not the earth) and the Holy Spirit really represents the divine Mother; but Mary's Virgin Birth links her also with Ishtar. The dove remains to remind us of the past, as Moses's horns remind us that Yahveh was once the moon.

The reviewer has been much interested in following the author's thesis as developed in this volume, though it has its weak points. Even the next volume, whatever its "reichliches Material", will, he feels sure, not convince the reviewer that the primitive Semitic religion was trinitarian and that all tribal gods were degenerate forms of one Father-god; but the argument as to the Kyrios has much in its favor.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Hellenic History. By GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. xi, 520. \$4.00.)

PROFESSOR BOTSFORD died suddenly in 1917. Among his papers was found the manuscript of his *Hellenic History*, the publication of which had already been announced. After an interval of five years, which is nowhere alluded to in the book, the obstacles have been overcome and the work is finally in our hands. Let us say at once and for all that it deserves a cordial welcome from college teachers of Greek history. The author's son, Mr. Jay Barrett Botsford of Brown University, appears as its editor and he acknowledges the assistance of several of his father's pupils and friends in the preparation for publication of the bibliographical and illustrative material.

It would be unfair to say that had the author lived to see his history through the press he would have been forced by the discoveries and investigations of the past five years to recast radically his text. Professor Botsford's conclusions on the main problems of his period had been reached deliberately and on the basis of a personal sifting of the evidence; so that they could hardly have been upset by the scientific yield of these lean years. That consideration, however, leaves untouched the fact that those responsible, whoever they may be, have put the author in a disadvantageous position by concealing the long interval that separates the completion of the manuscript and the publication of the book; for Professor Botsford was one of those meticulous scholars who make it their practice to take account in detail of every latest contribution. Such lack of candor is also an injustice to the public. And while we are on this subject of editorial responsibility, it behooves us to add that the proof-reading, especially of the foot-notes and bibliographical notes, is extremely careless, and that there is much to support the inference that this part of the manuscript was not properly made ready for the printer. There

is no possible excuse for what is found here from chapter V. on French, German, and Greek names; and titles are mutilated, at times beyond all possible recognition.

In the field of ancient history, text-book making is an American specialty. Professor Botsford's *Hellenic History* is inevitably a text-book, but for colleges; and it is more than that: it is an independent synthesis of Greek history as a whole. In this respect it is, we believe, unique in the American literature of the subject, and invites comparison with the contemporary European histories of Greece. Thus considered it speedily appears to approximate the text-book more closely than the general histories that have appeared recently in England and Germany, and this not simply in section-headings and such matters, but also in scope and design. For while they, like the *Hellenic History* and the "new history" of Columbia fame, take cognizance of cultural achievement in general and the phenomena of literature, art, and philosophy, they leave to specialists in these subjects the analysis of masterpieces, as works of art and science, on the formal or technical side, and never forget that political history is their main theme. We have read indulgently, and with a certain admiration for the author's zeal and learning, the many chapters of Professor Botsford's book devoted to these topics; yet we have concluded that we would rather read and advise others to read, on Greek art, literature, and philosophy, accessible works of comparable compass by Gardner, Jebb, Murray, and Burnet. The competition of the historian with craftsmen of such distinction, in their own specialties, is altogether too one-sided.

Probably Professor Botsford would have denied that political history was his main theme. This seems to us a pity; for its consequences are that he is cramped in its treatment. Yet it is in the use he makes, for the understanding of states and their operations, of the sources which disclose to us events and institutions that Professor Botsford does his best work. Here the pros and cons are balanced with a judgment that is as fair as his knowledge is adequate. Repeatedly our attention is arrested by a simple statement in which a new fact or point of view is unostentatiously presented. Naturally we do not agree in every instance, but we are at least challenged to defend our divergent opinions.

One fundamental in which the reviewer systematically dissents is in the value the author attaches to the historical part of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians*. In Professor Botsford's narrative, on the authority of this once much overrated work, Draco gets credit for a constitution, Clisthenes for ostracism, Aristides for radical democracy, and the Four Hundred for constitutionality. Here in each case we think that Aristotle was misled and that the variant report deserves the preference. On the other hand the reviewer finds illuminating the general view that Minoan sectionalism underlies some of the more notable differences in Middle-Age Greek institutions, since this is but a corollary to the observa-

tion that the area of Greece in which the *polis* develops is precisely the area of Mycenaean culture.

But this is not the place in which to record the particulars in which the reviewer and the author agree and disagree. To report the outstanding characteristic of the book will be more apposite: it is that the work as a whole is descriptive rather than interpretative in character—that it belongs with the histories of Busolt and Niese rather than with those of Beloch and Meyer. The author's handiwork is found primarily in the selecting and expressing and massing of the facts. He has no perceptible body of general ideas in the light of which he makes Greece intelligible to his readers. This is pardonable, if not positively virtuous, in a text-book, where the teacher can add *viva voce* the necessary contacts and contrasts with contemporary or other known epochs. It detracts terribly from the interest and significance of the work for the general reader. Will its detachment from the ephemeral spirit of its age—its seeming timelessness—bring compensation in the long run? Would Thucydides even have lived without the speeches?

W. S. FERGUSON.

Rome, la Grèce, et les Monarchies Hellénistiques au III^e Siècle avant J.-C. (273–205). [Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fascicule 124.] Par MAURICE HOLLEAUX. (Paris: E. de Boccard. 1921. Pp. iv, 386. 40 fr.)

THE author of this book has been long known in scientific circles in two different capacities—as director of the French School in Athens during its second great campaign at Delos, and as a student of Greek history especially of the Macedonian period. In the latter capacity M. Holleaux has distinguished himself by combining two qualities rarely associated, German thoroughness and attention to detail and French lucidity and grace of style. The book is true to form. Indeed it could hardly be otherwise, since it contains, now set in a larger structure, several of the author's earlier studies. The larger structure is, however, the essential novelty of the book.

The task M. Holleaux has set himself is to examine the alleged contacts of Rome and the Hellenistic states prior to 215 B. C. in the light that is thrown back upon them by his searching analysis of the circumstances in which Rome intervened in the East between 212 and 200 B. C. This analysis yields for him two convictions: (1) that the Roman account of Rome's relations with the Greeks is utterly unreliable when it either deviates from or supplements Polybius; and (2) that Rome did not possess at the time of the First and Second Macedonian wars old-established "friendships" (*amicitiae*) with Eastern cities and kingdoms, and that her whole course of action after the establishment of her protectorate over Illyricum in 229 B. C. precludes the idea that even then she had any conscious interest or policy in Hellenic affairs. M. Holleaux, accordingly,